



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

This prayer to God was then the form by which bishops and priests thought they were to perform their office in loosing men's sins.

Another form follows, in p. 668, which is also a prayer for the loosing of sin.

Another form, in page 666, is still a prayer that God will loose from the bond of sin.

In page 668, Goar gives another form, as follows: "O Lord our God, who wast present to Thy holy disciples and apostles, the doors being shut, and gavest to them Thy peace, saying, 'Whose sins ye remit, they are remitted to them, and whose sins ye retain they are retained, do Thou, most merciful Lord, intercede for this Thy servant such a one, and loose his sins, and cleanse the filth and defilement of his soul. For since having fallen into excesses he has fled to Thee, who alone art easy to be appeased; and as Thou hast loosed the harlots and publicans who formerly sinned, and hast given to them a perfect forgiveness, so loose Thy servant, such a one, from the bond of separation which rests on him, because Thou desirest that all men should be saved, and should come to the knowledge of the truth,' &c."

At page 673 Goar gives another form, in which the priest is directed to pray, "Do Thou receive with Thy accustomed humanity Thy servant such a one, who repents of the sins which he has committed." In another form in the same page the priest speaks thus: "Do Thou, O Lord, release, remit, pardon, the sins, the iniquities, the offences, willingly or unwillingly, knowingly or ignorantly, through transgression or disobedience, committed by these Thy servants. . . . So be it, O benign Lord; hear us entreating Thy goodness for these Thy servants, and overlook, as most merciful, all their sins; delivering them from eternal destruction, for Thou, O Lord, hast said, 'Whatsoever things ye bind upon earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever things ye loose upon earth shall be loosed in heaven.'"

Here the words spoken by our Saviour about loosing and binding are made the grounds of the priest praying that He will loose from sin, but not of the priest undertaking to forgive sin.

The form which follows in Goar, p. 674, is also remarkable: "O Lord our God, who gavest remission of sins to Peter, and to the harlot in her tears, and justified the publican confessing his offences, receive the confession of Thy servant, and if he has committed any sin, willingly or unwillingly, in word or deed or thought, do Thou as a good and benignant God to give him, FOR THOU ONLY HAST POWER TO FORGIVE SINS; and to Thee we ascribe glory," &c.

The following form, in the same page, 674, is more especially a form of absolution for sins confessed to the priest: "God, who for our sins was made man, and bearing the sins of the whole world, through His beneficent goodness, take away all these things which thou hast related before me unworthy, pardoning thee all things, both in this life and in that to come, and grant them to stand uncondemned before His judgment-seat, He who wills that all men should be saved, and carest for the salvation of all; who is blessed for ever and ever."

This prayer is remarkable, not merely for attributing all forgiveness to God, as all the others do, but for expecting a full forgiveness in this world, as well as in the world to come, thus excluding that notion of satisfaction for temporal punishment on which the doctrine of purgatory is founded.

In page 675, Goar gives the following form: "O God, who pardoned by Nathan the Prophet David," &c. (The form then recites the cases of Peter, of the woman who was a sinner, of Manasses in Babylon, of the prodigal, the publican, the thief on the cross, and then proceeds)—"Who hast said, 'Confess your sins to one another in turn;' as Thou hast said, Thou art faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all pollutions of the flesh and spirit, do Thou, all good and all merciful Lord, pardon all things which my spiritual son such a one has confessed with contrition of heart in Thy presence to me insignificant, both in this life and in the life to come, and grant that he may stand uncondemned before Thee."

The following is given by Goar, p. 675, as a form of St. Chrysostom:—

"O Sovereign Lord, Jesus Christ, our God, who didst pardon by Nathan the Prophet David," &c. (The form then recites the cases of Peter, of the woman who was a sinner, of Manasses in Babylon, of the prodigal, the publican, the thief on the cross, and then proceeds)—"Who hast said, 'Confess your sins to one another in turn;' as Thou hast said, Thou art faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all pollutions of the flesh and spirit, do Thou, all good and all merciful Lord, pardon all things which my spiritual son such a one has confessed with contrition of heart in Thy presence to me insignificant, both in this life and in the life to come, and grant that he may stand uncondemned before Thee."

Goar collected the foregoing formularies out of the ancient manuscripts from which he took the Greek liturgies, which manuscripts were transcribed in the tenth and eleventh centuries.

Goar appears to have felt the awkwardness of not being able to produce a single ancient formulary containing the words "I absolve thee;" and he admits that a question arises, whether these forms "effect or accom-

plish anything in respect of this sacrament (of penance), when on the face of them no form of words is therein contained which can be thought to include in itself the true form of absolution."

With the candour which belongs to real learning, Goar admits the fact, as well in respect of the Roman or Latin forms as the Eastern or Greek forms. His words are as follows:—"And, indeed, if it is lawful to conjecture from ecclesiastical history, from ancient rituals, from tradition, or from other unexceptionable testimonies, there are many who now freely assert, boldly propound, clearly teach, and happily write, that in the Latin Church the ancient form of the sacrament of penance or absolution was composed in words of prayer, and that the indicative and judicative form, so to speak, which we now use, 'I absolve thee from thy sins,' is not older than about four centuries, nor is found in any sacramentaries, nor mentioned by the more ancient writers, and that, therefore, MORE RECENTLY, but yet with great weight of reason, the Church was moved to have brought in that form as the common form, and to be used by all."

A confession more honourable to the learning and the candour of Goar could not be imagined.

But Goar was a priest of the Church of Rome, and as such felt himself bound to maintain her cause by the best arguments he could devise; and he was not deficient in that ingenuity which is so essential to the advocates of the Church of Rome.

So Goar tries to solve the difficulty:—"And, certainly, although the form of this sacrament be in the words of prayer, yet that does not exclude, but it contains, the act of the minister, and so can be reduced to the indicative form, and like the indicative implicitly requires the necessary mercy of God to the penitent; therefore, he who says 'remit, relax, pardon,' understands, BY ME. In like manner, 'Let it please Thee that Thy servant be loosed by the word' supply—'by my word.'"

Can anything be more simple than this? It is true the bishops and priests of the Church of God for the first TWELVE HUNDRED YEARS did never do more than pray to God that he would forgive sins; but, then, you have only to put into their prayers words which they NEVER used, which would make it appear that they forgave the sins themselves, and then it is all right, according to the Church of Rome.

But the fact stands confessed that the ancient bishops and fathers for twelve hundred years did never use such words, but did only pray that God would forgive the sins; and the candour of real learning compels Goar himself, even after he had proposed this ingenious device, to repeat the same confession again—"The Latins are not able to show a form of absolution conceived in these words, 'I absolve thee,' in any rituals more ancient than the fourth century from this (i.e., about the year 1240), which yet they profess to have received from the holy fathers by a succession of tradition."

Can any one believe this, that the ancient Fathers should have successively delivered to each other from the beginning that sins were to be forgiven by the priest saying "I forgive thee thy sins;" and yet that the formularies of the Church for twelve hundred years should always agree in praying that God Himself would do that work—forgive the sins Himself.

But if the Church of God was under this error for twelve hundred years, the Bishop of Rome should, of course, at last correct it when he found it out. Better late than never. If infallible Popes left the Church without a sacrament of the Gospel for twelve hundred years, it was time for them to correct it.

So Goar, at page 677, gives corrected forms prepared by the Pope for the Greeks, in which he inserts in the first prayer—"Pardoning him, THROUGH ME. Thy unworthy servant, every offence, voluntary and involuntary." And in the second prayer—"I absolve thee from all thy sins which thou hast confessed before God, and my unworthiness." And in the third prayer—"I pardon thee all thy sins."

Goar states, page 678, that this form was used in his time by all the Greeks living in Calabria, Apulia, and Sicily—that is, by the Greeks in Italy and Sicily who had submitted to the

Pope, and whom the Pope indulged in the use of their own forms, altered only so far as he thought essential.

But Goar feels it would be very awkward if these modern forms could not be supported by any ancient authority. Goar, therefore, brings forward a formulary from the most ancient enchiridion in the Barberini Library, p. 678, note at the end. The formulary itself is given in pages 679 and 680. There is nothing very much to the purpose in page 679; but in page 680 there are two prayers worth noting. The first is as follows, in which the priest says—"My spiritual son, I am lowly and a sinner, I am not able to forgive upon earth the sins of him who confesses to my lowliness; but God is, and through that divinely spoken word which he made after His resurrection, and said to His apostles, 'Whose sins ye remit,' &c.; confiding in that word, we also say, whatever things thou hast related to my lowliness, and whatever you were prevented saying, either through ignorance or forgetfulness, or from whatever cause, MAY GOD PARDON THEE in this life, and the life to come."

The second prayer has this heading, "Add also this prayer," which prayer is as follows:—"O God, who through the prophet Nathan didst pardon David, confessing his evil deeds; and Peter weeping bitterly his denial; and the harlot shedding tears upon Thy feet; and the publican; and the prodigal. God Himself pardon thee, through me a sinner, both in this life, and in that to come, and make thee stand uncondemned before His fearful judgment-seat, and have no care concerning the crimes confessed. Go in peace."

The first of these is unquestionably genuine and accurate; but it is as much against the Church of Rome as any other genuine formulary, because it takes the words of Christ only as grounds for the priest to pray that God would forgive the sins. The second prayer appears to support Goar's argument, because the priest prays "that God will pardon thee through me," thus making the priest the instrument of forgiving the sin. But here, again, the candour of Goar in matters of learning comes in; and he adds in a note on the prayer which contains the words "pardon thee through me"—"In the printed copies, however, and in all other manuscript copies, it is WANTING."

Truly there is nothing that damages the arguments of the Church of Rome so much as when her learned advocates are compelled by the candour of real learning to tell the truth.

The fact now stands out in striking and unmistakable proofs that for TWELVE HUNDRED YEARS after Christ no bishop or priest of the Church of God did ever address to a penitent those words, "I absolve thee."

Let Roman Catholics ponder on this. Let them tell us by what right their priests now dare to say those awful words; and let them tell us how the sacrament of penance in their Church, of which those words are declared by the Council of Trent to be the essential form, can be considered a sacrament of the Gospel, instituted by Christ Himself.

In our next number we will give the forms of absolution which were used in the Church of Rome herself, for 1200 years.

#### FATHER FURNISS AND THE RAMBLER.

We have no doubt that Dr. Cullen and his coadjutors often find it a puzzling practical question, how to deal with the CATHOLIC LAYMAN. On the one hand, they cannot but feel that it is damaging to their cause that they should be seen to shrink from candid and temperate discussion. They know very well that many of our intelligent Roman Catholic readers want to know if it is really the case that our statements and arguments admit of no reply; or if the priests can answer them, why do they not. But, on the other hand, the Roman Catholic leaders have an instinctive conviction that discussion and argument are not really for the interest of their cause. Of two evils they must choose the least. By attempting to answer our paper they would run the risk of making known its existence to many who are now ignorant of it, and, by exciting their curiosity, might increase the number of our readers. While even for those Roman Catholics who do read the CATHOLIC LAYMAN it is, perhaps, safer that they should be told that the priests, no doubt, could answer us very effectively if they thought it worth their while, than to bring matters to a crisis by attempting answers which, after all, might not turn out satisfactory. Accordingly, silence and affected contempt is the policy which it has been judged most expedient to pursue towards us, and we fully believe that Dr. Cullen and his friends are wise in their generation.

If there was ever a time, however, when it cost them an effort to persevere in their silent system, we fancy it must have been when the real character was exposed of Father Furniss's book, "What every Christian must know." They might calmly see us expose their errors on points of doctrine, trusting for their safety to men's general indifference to controversial discussion; but when the question is about those plain rules of morality which every one can understand, it is not equally safe to remain silent. We gave extracts in which lying and dishonesty and undutifulness to parents were made light of. Our readers could satisfy themselves by the expenditure of one halfpenny that our quotations were perfectly accurate, and it was not strange if they asked themselves whether a Church could be infallible whose authorised teachers give instruction so contrary to the plain rules of morality.

\* An aliquid circa sacramentum hocce valeant aut efficiant, cum nulla in eis verborum series prim: fro. te deprehendatur, quæ veram absolutionis formam in se includere possit existimari.—p. 676, n.

\* Goar wrote his about 1640; so he considered the form "I absolve thee," to have arisen about the year 1240.

\* Atque æquid si ex ecclesiastica historia, ritualibus antiquis, traditione, aut aliis non expiendis testimoniis conficere licet, antiquam in Ecclesia Latinâ, Penitentis sacramenti sive absolutionis formam, ce. recitavit verbis compositam fuisse; eamque indicativam et judicativam, ut ita loquar, quæ nunc utimur, absolve te a peccatis tuis, quatuor creiter sæculorum ætatem non superare, nec antiquius in sacramentalibus reperiri, aut ab antiquioribus scriptoribus referri, producere necesse est, æquo tam in rationum pondere motum ecclesiam, quam ut communem et ab omnibus recipiendam induxisset; plures jam sunt qui libere asserunt, tenaciter propagant, clare dicunt, et foeliciter scribunt.—Goar. Ritualis Gæcorum, p. 676, n.

\* Et certe forma hujus sacramenti etsi deprecativa, non excludit, imo continet actionem multâ, siquæ ad indicativam potest reduci; quænammodum indicativa Dei misericordiam penitentis necessarium expostulat implicite. Qui ergo dicit, ἀνεις, ἀφες, συγχώρησον; dimitti, relaxa, condona, subintelliget, per me; tem γον δουλων σου τω λογω λυθηναι ενδοκησον, complacet tibi nunc servum tuum verbo (supra le meo) so et.—p. 676, n.

\* Latini quarto ab hinc sæculo in antiquiori, si ritualibus indicativam sacramenti penitentis formam his verbis, absolve te a peccatis tuis conceptam nequeunt ostendere, quæ tamen esse, sicut traditionis serie ab antiquis Patribus acceptæ præstuntur.—p. 676, n.

These were circumstances in which the advocates of Romanism would naturally be anxious to come forward with some defence or explanation, if they could do it with safety; and, fortunately, they have been enabled to do it without venturing on so dangerous a step as a reply to the *CATHOLIC LAYMAN*; for the *Saturday Review*, a paper which does not usually meddle with theological questions, contained, a few weeks since, an article commenting on very much the same parts of Father Furniss's eccentric moral teaching to which we had already directed attention. So, as there was no danger in making known to Roman Catholics the existence of such a paper as the *Saturday Review*, the *Rambler* of this month contains an answer in due form, while Father Furniss has also come forward with a small tract in his own defence. We must say that Father Furniss conducts his own case in a tone of bluster only calculated to excite prejudice against him. For instance, the author of the advice to children not to curse their parents in their presence professes to come forward now to defend the "principles of morality" against the attacks of the *Saturday Review*. He takes pains also to disclaim having made any attempt to circulate his book in a country so little in need, as Ireland, of instruction in morals. His whole efforts were designed for the benefit of England, a country which he depicts as one large mass of heathenism, and as disgraced by a gigantic system of perjury. The "perjury" is that the English clergy and legislature swear assent to certain doctrines which in Father Furniss's opinion are not and cannot be true, it being perjury, apparently, for any man to profess by oath a belief in any doctrine which Father Furniss conceives to be false. After this specimen of his tone, and of his knowledge of the "principles of morality," it will probably be acknowledged that he would have done better to leave his cause in the hands of the *Rambler* than to attempt to maintain it himself. However, we shall give him the benefit of both defences, and shall lay before our readers the strongest points of both.

The first point selected by the *Rambler* is the instruction given to children in "What every Christian must know," that it is a grievous sin to strike their parents, or in their presence to put out their tongues at them, or mock them, or the like, through spite or contempt, or in their hearing to call them very bad names, such as foos, beasts, or drunkards." The reader is requested to bear in mind that the italics in the above quotation are not ours, but Father Furniss's own.

Father Furniss's defence is as follows:—"I affirm that it is a grievous sin to commit a gross act of disrespect before a parent in his presence. Oh! says the reviewer, you thereby teach that smaller acts of disrespect are not sins at all. Suppose the reviewer affirmed that murder was a grievous crime, would it be honest in me to affirm that he thereby teaches that anything short of murder, such as assault and battery, or knocking a man down, are quite lawful?"

Our answer to this question would depend very much on the manner in which the reviewer might have said "that murder was a grievous crime." Suppose, for instance, that the reviewer, at an election, had given directions to his friends, "Boys, if you meet any of the opposite party, do not beat them in such a way as that they shall die of it. It would be a grievous crime if you were to beat them so as to kill them." And if he were to take pains to lay particular emphasis on these words, so as to kill them, no one could help inferring that he meant to imply, that though murder was a grievous crime, assault and battery was comparatively venial. And is there any one who would be imposed on if he were afterwards to defend himself—"I did say, don't beat them so as to kill them; and surely you do not mean to assert that a mere beating is as bad as a murder."

The *Rambler* says, on the same subject, that a Protestant must allow that it is a different offence to curse one's parent in his presence or in his absence. Some might think one the greater offence, and some the other. In the *Rambler's* own opinion the cursing in their absence is the worst offence of the two, but this is a mere matter of private opinion, and Father Furniss is not to be quarrelled with for a difference of opinion on a delicate point of casuistry.

The *Rambler* adds, that there can be no doubt that Father Furniss believes that cursing one's parents in their absence is a sin, though not so great a sin as in their presence, but that it is only to be regretted that he omitted here to say so. "Whatever be the case, the fact is evident, that Father Furniss has made an omission in his little book, by forgetting to state, in this place, the whole of the case which has laid him open fairly to misconception. It is simply an instance of oversight which any Catholic who used the book would instantly repair of his own accord, but which, of course, we can scarcely blame a Protestant for laying hold of. As it has been the occasion, in this instance, of adding an apparently real weight to charges otherwise baseless, we have no doubt that he has himself been the very first to regret it. No doubt he considered, as was not at all unreasonable, that his statements, as quoted above, would be taken in practical connection with what he says on the same subject in an earlier page and section of this book, where he certainly states that the insults he is condemning are worse when committed in a parent's presence than when in his absence, but where he most pointedly condemns them under both circumstances.

The omission, therefore, in the second place is one which could hardly have been laid hold of, except by those who were either predisposed to misunderstand him, or were unable, from want of comprehension of the laws of moral science, to do him fair justice."

It will be seen that this defence comes to much the same as Father Furniss's own, as if his fault were one of mere omission; just as if a person who said that murder was a sin were blamed for omitting to state at the same time, that it was a sin to rob a man or to knock him down. But any one of common understanding can see that Father Furniss is not blamed for what he omitted, but for what he introduced, and went out of his way to introduce. Would it not have been quite enough for him to say that it is wrong for children to curse their parents? When he adds the words, "in their presence," he certainly gives his readers grounds to suspect that he thought cursing them behind their backs a comparatively trifling offence; but when he not only adds the words, "in their presence," but puts them in italics, it is a case of suspicion no longer. It is quite plain that it is not a mere "oversight," or "instance of omission," but that the writer knew what he was about, and designedly made the distinction for which he was censured.

Again, we are told that Father Furniss is not to be quarrelled with if he has even decided wrongly a delicate point of casuistry. This might be said very well if it were said in defence of Liguori, or of any one else who wrote for the instruction of confessors. It might be thought necessary that they should know how to balance one sin against another, and judge which is most worthy of censure. But why are children such as those for whom Mr. Furniss's book is written to be given lessons in casuistry? Where is the necessity for refusing to warn them against sin, without instructing them, at the same time, that there are other sins which they can commit with less criminality? No rational person can doubt that the proper instruction to be given to children is to tell them simply that they shall not curse their parents at all, but obey them in all things, as St. Paul directs; and that it is not justifiable to put it into a child's head that it is only in the parent's presence that the use of such disrespectful language is sinful.

Before quitting the subject of cursing one's parents in their absence, it may be well to give the arguments by which St. Liguori defends the doctrine which Father Furniss has adopted from him.

"Spörer says absolutely that if a son curses his parents, or mocks at them, he is not excused from mortal sin, whether he does it in their presence or in their absence. I do not know how this author, who is moderate enough in his other opinions, and, perhaps, sometimes over-indulgent, could make this assertion so absolutely; for, as he confesses himself, and every one teaches, no harm is done to reverence or respect but by insult offered in a man's presence, or, if it be in his absence, with the purpose of its coming to his knowledge. And, besides, there is the argument which is used by very many grave doctors, who say that sacrilege is not committed, and a church is not polluted by fornication in it, provided it be committed secretly, on the grounds that due respect to a church, like character, consists in the opinion of men. Consequently, as men do not lose their character unless their crimes are made public, so the reverence of a holy place is not violated unless the crime is publicly known. However it may be about this opinion (which is quite probable, as the Salamanca doctors say, though the opposite appears to be more probable, because of the irreverence to God, who is specially present in a church, and sees everywhere in secret), what I am concerned with is the reason that they bring forward—viz., that no harm is done to reverence but by an open manifestation of insult. How, then, can a son sin gravely when he curses his father without his knowing it, or mocks at him behind his back, inasmuch as in this case there is neither insult nor irreverence? And I think the same is to be said, even though he does this before others. Still, I do not deny that there is in it a sort of slight which is opposed to due filial reverence and a special *malitia contra pietatem continentem*; but it does not reach to mortal sin, except in case the son cursed them with malevolent meaning or with great contempt; for example, if he should curse them in the presence of others with the purpose of their carrying it to his parents, or supposing that they would carry it."

Having thus given Father Furniss the benefit of showing that his opinions on the subject of cursing fathers were not adopted without grave authority, we pass to another topic.

The next point is dealt with in the following extract from the *Saturday Review*:

"But what notions of truth or honesty can young persons have whose principles are corrupted by such maxims as the following:—

"It is a venial sin to steal a little. It is a mortal sin to steal much; for example, to steal from a workman a day's wages, or to steal less from a poorer man, or more from a richer man, or from parents. (If you steal from different persons, it needs half as much again for a mortal sin, and the same if you steal at different times. If you steal from different persons as well as at different times, it needs double the sum.)"

"This is morality with a vengeance. So a servant may

be in the daily habit of robbing his employer; but if the articles or money stolen at any one time are of small amount—small, that is, compared with his employer's income—he is guilty of but a trivial fault. A poor man earns (suppose) half-a-crown-a-day. You must not venture to rob him of half-a-crown—i.e., at a time, but to take a halfpenny less than half-a-crown is a venial sin. And, if you are content to rob or cheat him of sixpence at a time, you may go as far as three shillings and eightpence halfpenny. Or if you can manage to plunder several persons in the day, the offence is still a trivial one, provided the gross amount of your peculations does not exceed a day-and-a-half's income of any one of them, or of all together, for it is not very clear which is meant. But suppose you are in no particular hurry, and can filch a little now and then from every person you can lay hold of, you may go to double the amount of robbery without laying a burden upon your conscience."

The *Rambler's* reply to this is, that the *Saturday Review* is guilty of gross unfairness in substituting the word "trivial" for the word "venial" in the above extract.

In order to enable our readers to judge of the justice of this criticism, we must say a few words in explanation of the Roman Catholic distinction between mortal and venial sin, which we own is not understood by many Protestants, and is, indeed, a point on which many Roman Catholics, too, appear not to have clear ideas. In the Roman Catholic system, then, the distinction between mortal and venial sin is not one of degree, but of kind. It is not merely that the Church of Rome represents one sin as less than another; or, again, that she teaches that there are sins which, though committed by God's people, are not imputed against them; but it is that she teaches that these sins are in their own nature venial—that ten thousand such sins all together could not equal one mortal sin, nor destroy charity, nor put us from the favour of God; that these are sins for which no man could perish, even though God's merciful covenant of pardon did not intervene; that these sins are not such as in themselves deserve to be visited with eternal punishment, and, consequently, that they do not stand in need of our Saviour's atonement, and form no part of those sins which, by the sacrifice of Himself, He put away. Father Furniss directs us as follows—"If you commit a venial sin, strike your breast to beg God's pardon; at least for a moment be sorry for it, and resolve not to do it again. Do not be vexed at yourself nor discouraged, because there is no profit in sadness." And the *Rambler* states the question to be, whether the practices discussed by Father Furniss are or are not to be regarded as "offences against the infinite majesty of Almighty God—as a portion of that mountain of guilt which the Eternal Son shed His blood to atone for."

We said that Roman Catholics are very commonly ignorant of the real doctrine of their Church about mortal and venial sin; at least, they show such ignorance in the objections which they bring against Protestants who deny their distinction. They ask such Protestants, do you then mean to say that all sins are alike, and that it is an equal sin to murder your father or to steal your neighbour's cabbages? The simple answer is, that Protestants readily admit that there is a distinction in degree between sins, but they deny that there is a distinction in kind. They hold that every sin is, in its own nature, damnable, and sufficient, if the Divine mercy had not interposed, to entail on the sinner eternal separation from God, and that it is actually visited with this sentence in the case of the impenitent. Now, when this is explained it will be seen that the *Rambler's* criticism on the *Saturday Review* is a mere evil. By substituting the word trivial for the word venial the *Saturday Review* only understates his own case; for the word trivial only implies a difference in degree, such as, no doubt, in a great measure exists between the offences condemned and more serious crimes. The word venial implies that the sins classed under this head are so totally different in kind from others of deeper dye as to be in themselves not deserving of the sentence denounced by God upon those who disobey Him.

And the *Rambler* goes on immediately after to lose sight totally of the distinction which he charges the *Saturday Review* with forgetting:—

"Is, then, the writer before us prepared to deny altogether that there exists any such distinction between one sin and another? Impossible. He cannot do it. None but a ranting Calvinist can maintain a proposition so purely nonsensical and utterly subversive of all practical morality. Is it an equally wicked thing to steal twopence and to commit murder? Is it as wicked a thing for a maid servant to nibble at her mistress's tea and sugar two or three times a week as to play the Sir John Paul, the Leopold Redpath, or the John Sadleir? Is it no sign of a worse disposition and more reckless conscience to steal five shillings from a poor widow, who has not another farthing in the world, rather than from the Duke of Sutherland or the Marquis of Westminster?"

Our readers will see that all this ranting talk of the *Rambler* is quite beside the question. No one denies that one sin may betray a worse disposition and a more reckless conscience than another. But what we say is, that all are alike truly and properly sins, in the fullest sense of the word. We absolutely refuse to subscribe to the *Rambler's* classification of thefts, according to the amount which the thief has opportunities to steal. According to

Father Furniss and the *Rambler*, a theft under half-a-crown is a venial offence, to be got rid of "by striking one's breast, and being sorry for it at least for a moment;" a theft of ten pounds is a serious matter; one of a hundred pounds ten times as bad; while a bank director, who has opportunities to commit his plunder by thousands, is a monster of iniquity, whose name can be made a byword to express the highest point of all dishonesty. This may be the *Rambler's* scale, but we hesitate not to say that the Searcher of hearts will estimate the guilt of the transgressors according to a very different rule—namely, the state of the heart and conscience of the offender, and not merely the scale on which he had opportunities to carry on his depredations. It is quite possible that the maid servant who has not found it safe to steal more than her mistress's tea and sugar, or the little boy (in his other example) whose temptations or whose opportunities may not have yet proceeded beyond thefts of pennies to buy apples, may, in the sight of God, have betrayed hearts as reckless of the divine precept against theft as John Sadleir himself, and may be known by Him only to have wanted opportunities to rival that worthy's depredations.

The true distinction of sins depends altogether upon the disposition of mind in which the sin is committed: the attempt to classify them according to "gravity of matter" only leads to ludicrous absurdity. Who does not feel it to be an absurdity to define that a theft of 2s. 6d. destroys charity, separates from the love of God, and is punishable with eternal fire, whereas a theft of 2s. 5½d. would have been attended with none of these pernicious consequences; while again stealing 3s. 8½d. from two different people would be quite compatible with remaining in the love and favour of God? The absurdity of such decisions as these is simply ludicrous, and yet they naturally result from the system of the Church of Rome, which requires of all Christians to bring their sins periodically to be classed and tabulated by a priest. The poor priest cannot see the hearts, and has, therefore, no means of judging with any certainty of these circumstances of disposition of the mind of sinners in which the real differences between sins depend, and so he is compelled to look for some tangible, easily-found grounds of distinction. And so he can find nothing but "gravity of matter," and has recourse to his books, where he has everything comfortably settled for him, and where he finds the whole matter reduced to a regular tariff, the amount which can be stolen without mortal sin being regulated according to the income of the person defrauded.

We must say that the defence made for Father Furniss by the *Rambler* discloses deeper ignorance of the true nature of sin, and illustrates the lowering effects of the teaching of the Church of Rome on the moral judgments of her disciples, more forcibly than even Father Furniss's book itself.

For instance, the *Rambler* undertakes to defend the now celebrated decision of the Redemptorist Father, that it is no sin to "mix something with what you sell; for example, water with any liquor, if there is a common custom of doing it, or if it is necessary in order to gain a reasonable profit."

The *Rambler* thinks that such practices may possibly be undesirable or improper upon other and social grounds, but that the idea of their being *sins* is (to use a favourite expression of the *Rambler's*) "unmitigated fudge."

"Does the reviewer himself, when he swears—we beg his pardon, reviewers never swear—when he mildly remarks on the sky-blue tint of the fluid on his breakfast table, ever, in his own conscience, deliberately believe that the unfortunate vendor of milk and water, who has the honour of supplying him, is guilty of an absolute real sin against the great God of heaven and earth? Nonsense! He believes nothing of the sort, any more than a parliamentary opposition believe one-half of the charges they bring against those who are enjoying the blessed privilege of sitting on the Treasury benches. He may hold that watering milk or cabbaging cloth is an offence against society; but as for placing it in the category of positive, actual sins against Almighty God, it is all moonshine to pretend that any sensible person does so in his own mind."

It will be seen that the *Rambler* goes a step beyond Father Furniss; for Father Furniss has no objection to admit that watering milk and sanding pepper would be sins if carried to an extent greater than that sufficient to gain a reasonable profit. In his printed book, indeed, he has omitted to define what that extent is; but we have no doubt that in the spirit of rigid and accurate arithmetical definition which has fixed 2s. 6d. as the limit of theft without mortal sin, Father Furniss would have no objection to give private instructions fixing more precisely what he meant by a reasonable profit. If, for instance, he were to find that the milk vendors of a particular locality were in the habit of mixing but one part of water with two of milk, then he would decide that a milk vendor who should mix half and half was demanding an unreasonable profit, and therefore guilty of actual positive sin. When Father Furniss is at his breakfast table, however indifferent the beverage supplied to him may be, still as long as it is up to the average standard, he feels that the vendor is only using his legitimate privileges; but should some unusual falling off in the quality cause the good father to "swear, or mildly remark," as the case may be, then we gather from his book that, in defiance of the *Rambler*, he would pronounce the

seller to be guilty, not only of a breach of social duty, but of a positive sin against God.

The *Rambler*, however, not being so deeply read in books of casuistry as Father Furniss, feels strongly the absurdity of defining the exact per-centage of water which may be lawfully mixed with milk, and so he makes short work of the matter. He cannot believe it possible that the great God of heaven and earth can trouble Himself with such trifles. He cannot think that the Almighty God could stoop to regard such petty offences as the little dishonest artifices by which a poor shopkeeper tries to make a few pence more for his family. We shall not inquire whether this is a very consistent view of things to be taken by a member of a Church which holds that it is a mortal sin to eat more than one-eighth of an ounce of flesh meat on a day of abstinence, and which, therefore, must believe that there are some trifles which God does stoop to regard. But, consistent or not, the *Rambler* holds that this system of petty plunder, however socially inconvenient, is not disapproved by God, and is consistent with a high profession of religion. The *Rambler*, in short, sees nothing to find fault with in the directions of the grocer in the story to his boy. "Peter, have you sanded the sugar? Yes. Have you dusted the pepper? Yes. Have you watered the rum? Yes. Then put up the shutters and come in to prayers."

We do not hesitate to say that the whole tone of the *Rambler* on this subject is absolutely inconsistent with the spirit of Christianity. True Christianity tolerates no divorce between religion and morality. The true Christian considers himself bound to do *all things* to the glory of God, and regards all the ordinary duties of his daily and social life as work given him to do by the Master who has redeemed him—work which he is bound to do faithfully for His sake and in His sight. Let any one compare the doctrine of the *Rambler* with the directions which St. Paul gives to the Christian slaves who were among his converts as to the spirit in which they were to discharge their daily tasks, and when he has studied the teaching of St. Paul, let him judge what the great Apostle would have said if he had heard one of his professing followers at the same time condemning conduct as an offence against society, and pronouncing it innocent in the sight of God, and such as a Christian might lawfully commit, as far as God's judgment was concerned.

There are many more points suggested by these attempts to prop up the morality of "What every Christian must know," but we fear that we have already made our article too long.

#### THE RELIGION OF PICTURES.

THE religion of the Church of Rome must advance. There is no standing still in the way she has chosen to herself. Error must be propagated, or it falls. Men must learn new notions of religion which their fathers knew not, or the Church of Rome cannot accomplish its objects.

And to aid that progression of error, without which it cannot hold its ground, everything that is beautiful in nature or conception must be degraded into instruments of falsehood, as if, of all things which God has made, TRUTH alone could not be beautiful.

Yet TRUTH is beautiful in itself; and FALSEHOOD is hateful in itself. For that very reason FALSEHOOD must try to look beautiful in itself, and must try to make TRUTH look ugly.

It is an old story. St. Paul complains that "false apostles are deceitful workmen, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ; and no wonder, for Satan himself transformeth himself into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers be transformed as the ministers of justice, whose end shall be according to their works." 2 Cor. xi. 13, 14, 15.

To follow this example is all that now remains for the Church of Rome, in the course on which she has entered.

We say this, having before our eyes a skilful and beautiful device of "a deceitful workman."

The religion of the Church of Rome is fast becoming a religion of pictures. Pictures now wink their eyes to establish articles of faith; and pictures must, of course, support the articles of faith which they promulgate.

He who will now seek the religion of the Church of Rome, must seek it her pictures, where he will find it, and not in the Douay Bible, where he will not find it.

We have, accordingly, visited a well-known shop, not twenty miles from Essex-bridge, established in this city of Dublin for propagating the religion of the Church of Rome.

That picture shop is, of course, known to Archbishop Cullen. If he disapproved of that shop, he would, of course, require it to be closed, or would, at least, warn "the faithful" against the extensive trade which it is there carrying on, as much as he warns them against the CATHOLIC LAYMAN. He has warned them against this paper; he has not warned them against the wares of this shop. We presume, therefore, that he considers its pictures unobjectionable, or even deserving of his approbation.

From purchases at the picture mart, we have selected

as the subject of this article a picture drawn by a French priest—the Abbe Lambert.<sup>b</sup>

It is a double picture, having two pictures on one sheet. The picture opposite the left hand commemorates the "Immaculate Conception;" that opposite the right hand, the "Perpetual Adoration of the Holy Sacrament."

Both these things have been established by the present Pope. He, for the first time, has made "the Immaculate Conception" an article of faith in the Church of Rome. He has also established in some Church (we believe at Rome) a perpetual adoration of the sacrament.

The Church of Rome is now responsible for these things. The things must, therefore, be represented in such a garb as will make them look beautiful. "A deceitful workman" is wanted; and the Abbe Lambert, a priest of the Church of Rome, comes forward as well skilled in that department, and his work is sold in Dublin, to the great contentment of Dr. Cullen.

As a work of art, we feel bound to give Abbe Lambert's picture a very high commendation. Considering the pains taken with the execution of it, and the price at which it is sold, it is clearly not intended for the poor or the ignorant, but for those who can spend money, and who can appreciate the beauties of art. It is to introduce to them "the religion of pictures" that it is got up; and those who live by selling such things must expect that they will sell.

We will now give a description of this picture, to illustrate what we mean by "the religion of pictures."

The picture opposite the right hand is in commemoration of "the perpetual adoration." At the top is a picture of GOD THE FATHER, which the ancient Christians thought it profane to make. Immediately underneath is a picture of a dove, as representing the Holy Spirit. Underneath is the picture of our Saviour, extending to the foot of the painting.

On either side of God the Father are the cherubims. On the left hand side is the motto, "The Court celestial love and adore;" on the right hand side, "The Court celestial love and revere."

Immediately between the Dove and the head of our Saviour is a cup, held by an angel on the left side, with the motto, "The angel of perpetual adoration." On the left hand side are other angels, with the motto, "Anges de l'amende honorable." We give this in the French, really not knowing how to translate it in an ecclesiastical sense.

On the left of the picture, and the right hand side of our Saviour, stands Pope Pius IX., with the triple crown upon his head, and bedizen with all kinds of gorgeous apparel, with the motto, "SS. Pius IX. founding the perpetual adoration." On the right are various figures, with the motto, "The religious of the perpetual adoration," meaning, we suppose, the order established to perpetuate it.

Lower down, on the left hand side, are other figures, with the motto, "The whole Hierarchy of the Church." On the right hand side are figures, with the motto, "Innocence and repentance." And at the foot are, on the left hand side, figures in monkish dresses, with the motto, "The different religious orders;" and on the right hand other figures, with the motto, "The different states of the Church."

All these figures are in the attitude of prayer. The object of that prayer is indicated in a scroll proceeding from the hands of Pope Pius IX. That scroll bears the words, "WE ADORE FOR EVER THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT." The other end of the scroll passes by the head of Christ, to point to the cup in the angel's hand. THE OBJECT of the worship of Pope Pius IX., and all his Church, and all the host of heaven, as far as he can direct them, is not the figure of Christ in this picture, but the holy sacrament in the hand of the angel. It is the best representation we have seen of the worship of the modern Church of Rome. But what would St. Cyprian, and St. Basil, and St. Ambrose, and St. Augustine have said to such a picture?

And it is worthy of observation that the present pope, Pius IX., is represented as "founding the perpetual adoration;" and just over him is "the angel of the perpetual adoration," holding the cup. Who appointed this angel to take charge of the "perpetual adoration?" Was it God? If so, where is the revelation of it? Was it the Pope? If so, where is his authority over the angels of God?

But we must proceed to the picture opposite the left hand, which is intended to commemorate the immaculate conception.

We conceive it to be our duty to describe this picture, although the task be painful to the reverence which as Christians we feel towards God.

At the top of the picture is a representation of the Holy Trinity. We try to speak of it with due reverence. God the Father and God the Son are represented as a MAN, with two heads, one body, and two arms. One of the heads is like the ordinary pictures of our Saviour. The other is the head of an old man, surmounted by a triangle. Out of the middle of this figure is proceeding the Holy Ghost in the form of a dove. We think it must be painful to any Christian mind, and repugnant to Christian feeling, to look at this figure. On either side, the cherubim and heavenly host are represented. Just

<sup>b</sup> In the lower left hand corner are the words, "L'Abbe Lambert pinxit."

\* See the Picture of Rimini, CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. I., p. 64.